

Group Memory
CAC Meeting – July 24, 2003
Hopland Bypass.

Website address:

www.dot.ca.gov

then District 1

Projects

Hopland Bypass.

Next Meeting dates

~~September 4, 2003 at Field Station. 6:00 – 8:00~~

October 15th, 2003

Desired outcome for October 15, 2003 ??

Review the VA report

Desired Outcome for November 5 2003

Report on recommendations –

Desired outcome for September 2004

See results of Praj's work

Desired outcome for July meeting:

Review results of the VA study.

Desired outcome for May 1 meeting:

Review the list of comments for the route alternatives

Identify things we want to avoid. Refine the list, prioritize the CAC VA list.

Decide how we want to be represented.

Bin List & Great Ideas

1. What about things we should avoid? Not just what we want, but what we specifically don't want?
(Dick S, Feb 5, 2003)
2. On-going status of the project. Finances. (Todd; Feb 5, 2003)
- 3.

Group Decisions

All decisions made will be double underlined in the body of the notes below.

1. (Date)

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a ~~strike through~~, but left on the list. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

Ref. #	Who	What	When
1	Alan	Get an alignment history for the group. Provide a copy of this to the VA Team Facilitator as well.	02/24/03
2	Alan	Get the notes out to the group.	02/07/03
3	Group	Take the list back to the community; get input for the next meeting.	03/18/03

From March 18, 2003

4	Praj	Provide copies of the PowerPoint presentation that has the walk throughs — put this on the internet.	4/2/03 5/5/03
5	Praj	Provide 50 copies of 11X17 of the five route alternative maps. Get them to the Construction Office.	03/28/03
6	Alan	Put the big maps up in the Construction Field Office in Hopland.	3/19/03
7	Alan	Bring a set of maps to the meetings. The BIG ones.	On going
8	Praj	Provide Big maps of the North Hopland concepts.	4/09/03
9	Alan	E mail these notes to the committee	03/21/03

Assignments From May 1, 2003

10	Alan	Put new powerpoint and the eight maps as links on the web for the CAC to download.	5/7
11	Alan	E mail these notes to the committee. Also include the notes from March meetingh, since we tweaked them a little at this meeting.	5/5
12	Praj	Traffic volume on East Side Road and on 175 has changed a lot (increases) since the casino expanded. Caltrans needs to update the traffic count. Please advise CT.	July mtg
13	Praj	Investigate Russian River Levee project. Work with Michelle.	July mtg
14	Alan	Send out the agenda and information on the VA meeting.	5/5

Assignments From July 24, 2003

15	Alan	Caltrans Traffic Forecasting Section has released a report. We will get it put on the web in a PDF format on the web. (see discussion outline # 4) Also get a few copies to the Hopland RE Office in two weeks.	8/15/03
----	------	---	---------

16	Praj	Need to verify that we are looking into both East Side Road intersections with Route 175 Please advise Caltrans. (see discussion outline # 4)	10/15/03
17	Alan	Notes out to the group.	7/28/03
18	Praj	Bring the wall maps to the Oct Mtg.	10/15/03

Critique from May meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All of it. 2. North reviewed. 3. Nice to see important issues brought up. 4. CT received a lot of good information. 5. Got information on frontage road considerations. 6. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.

Critique from July meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Praj's presentation Food. Good comments from the group. Candor from CT staff.	Room not quite large enough if everyone shows up.

Definition: The Community Advisory Committee provides a regular forum for community members, organizational representatives, and the Department to communicate with each other regarding the projects on an ongoing basis.

Role: The CAC will serve as the primary voice of the community on topics pertaining to the development phase of the Hopland Bypass project. The CAC is intended to help identify problems and articulate and clarify key issues of interest to the local community.

The advisory committee is not a decision-making body.

The CAC is intended to communicate local viewpoints to the Project Development Team – the project’s technical committee. The Project Development Team makes final project recommendations to Department Management.

It is important to note that, for a variety of compelling reasons, Caltrans cannot always implement input provided by the CAC. When this occurs, the Department will provide a clear reason.

1. Ground Rules

1. 1. Start and end on time.
1. 2. One conversation at a time.
1. 3. Cell phones set to stun.
1. 4. Be courteous.
1. 5. No smoking.

2. Decision making process:

2. 1. Consensus if possible..
2. 2. This is not a technical decision making group.

3. Opening and Purpose of meeting

3. 1. Get as global overview of the VA study.
3. 2. Draft VA study report will not be out until the end of August.
3. 3. We want to review the schedule and see where we fit in; what do we want to do after this?

Traffic volume on East Side Road and on 175 has changed a lot (increases) since the casino expanded. Caltrans needs to update the traffic count. Please advise CT.
--

Investigate Russian River Levee project. Work with Michelle.
--

4. Upshot report on item 12: “Traffic volume on East Side Road and on 175 has changed a lot (increases) since the casino expanded. Caltrans needs to update the traffic count. Please advise CT.”

4. 1. Traffic volumes have picked up and things are changing. Issue is that Caltrans needs to insure its traffic study is current.
4. 2. Caltrans Traffic Forecasting Section has released a report. We will get it put on the web in a PDF format on the web. (see upshot assignment # 15)
4. 3. Caltrans will ensure that traffic data are updated.

4. 4. Group concern: Need to verify that we are looking into both East Side Road intersections with Route 175. (see upshot assignment # 16)
4. 5.
5. Investigate Russian River Levee project. Work with Michelle.
 5. 1. Praj met with others on this; This is an already existing idea.
 5. 2. Issues:
 5. 2. 1. Need to be outside the river by the width of a “meander.” Fish and Game would have the interest of regaining and improving the Russian River habitat. This will not work well in Hopland because the levees would be outside the valley.
 5. 2. 2. Also because the flooding is caused by backwater, levees would probably make things worse.
6. Discussion of the VA Study
 6. 1. Issues from the group were communicated to the VA team.
 6. 2. Concern is that tribes would appreciate keeping information which, through its release to the public would damage culturally sensitive areas, please keep the information out of the printed report. Caltrans does not release the information that pinpoints the sites; just indicates that there is cultural resource / archeological site which needs protection.
 6. 3. Group comments:
 6. 3. 1. Very impressed with the VA process.
 6. 4. VA report not complete.
 6. 5. VA Study is one of many sources of input for the project.
 6. 6. First big issue looked at was **flooding**. Many concepts resulted from people looking at flooding of 175. Many ideas got more expensive as we looked at solving the flooding issue. This issue was focused on as a consequence of the CAC bringing this issue up. To solve 175 flooding would require a viaduct, which would add a lot of cost to the project (maybe 50 million.) Cost could be prohibitive.
 6. 7. The **earthwork** was discussed. There is a need for material to be imported. This is expensive. Balancing the earthwork can improve the efficiency of the project, minimize this cost. Knight Hill is one potential source of material. IF we picked NHF1 and E-1, it would require 200 X 150 foot, mile and a half long pile of earth.
 6. 8. There is a true need behind the discussion in terms of increasing traffic.
 6. 9. **TRAFFIC ISSUES** / Forecasting consideration on number of exits: Hopland is already a destination. It won't matter how many access points we get, Hopland is still a destination, according to some. If we have four interchanges, we need to balance the costs somehow. We do need to consider emergency access.
 6. 10. **TRAFFIC ISSUES** / Forecasters say that expressway design would not achieve the level of service desired. Group comment: “Can we combine expressway and freeway designs?”
 6. 11. **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**: It was very difficult to find any new way to align environmental issues – it is a balancing act, and any changes in one category of issues will affect issues in another.

6. 12. **Fundability:** The project could be broken into smaller pieces. Downside to this is that you end up with a lot of little pieces that sit until you get the funding to tie things together, use the fill materials, etc. Build smaller fundable operational pieces. Depending on the alternatives chosen, some strategy like this could be used.
7. Risk study
 7. 1. Risk analysis for this project: VA report will include the risk study.
8. Where do we go from here?
 8. 1. Caltrans has learned from the group, and will work to develop the next set of modifications.
 8. 2. There will be a public open house, other ways to get public input; bring comments to the PDT, and make a design recommendation.
9. Funding update:
 9. 1. Funding is a risk issue.
 9. 2. This project is partially funded – We have funds for environmental document and project report. We don't have the amount of traffic major urban areas have; we need to partner with other agencies and build our political base to get funding.
 9. 3. We need to be able to show our momentum to keep funding.
 9. 4. We need funding for design phase, R/W Phase and the construction phase.
 9. 5. There is less ambiguity on North Hopland.
 9. 6. Opportunity for us is to work together. Come up with good ideas, things we can live with.
10. CAC next steps:
 10. 1. We want to target the open house for January.
 10. 2. We want to schedule a meeting with you in November.